arXiv:1703.09408v1 [math.DG] 28 Mar 2017

Pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds

Tomoya Nakamura *
email: x-haze@ruri.waseda.jp

March 29, 2017

Abstract

We introduce the notion of pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds. These manifolds are generalizations of Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds by Magri and Morosi [11]. We show that any pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold has an associated quasi-Lie bialgebroid as in the case of Poisson quasi-Nijenhuis manifolds by Stiénon and Xu [13]. Hence, since a quasi-Lie bialgebroid has an associated Courant algebroid, we have new materials to construct Courant algebroids. In the "nondegenerate" case, we show that the conditions of pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structures can be reduced. Therefore we can provide lots of non-trivial examples of pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds.

1 Introduction

Kosmann-Schwarzbach [5] showed that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds (M, π, N) and the Lie bialgebroids $((TM)_N, (T^*M)_\pi)$, where $(TM)_N$ is a Lie algebroid deformed by the Nijenhuis structure N and $(T^*M)_\pi$ is the cotangent bundle equipped with the standard Lie algebroid structure induced by the Poisson structure π. On the other hand, Stiénon and Xu [13] showed that a Poisson quasi-Nijenhuis manifold (M, π, N, ϕ) corresponded to a quasi-Lie bialgebroid $((T^*M)_\pi, d_N, \phi)$ introduced by Roytenberg[12]. A pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold (M, π, N, Φ) corresponds to "the opposite side" of $((T^*M)_\pi, d_N, \phi)$, that is, a quasi-Lie bialgebroid $((TM)_N, d_\pi, \Phi)$. Here d_N and d_π are operators of $\Gamma(\Lambda^* T^*M)$ and $\Gamma(\Lambda^* TM)$, respectively, and a *pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structure* on M is a triple consisting of a 2-vector field π which does not need to be

*Department of Mathematics, Waseda University, 3-4-1, Okubo, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, Japan

a Poisson structure, a Nijenhuis structure N "compatible" with π and a 3-vector field Φ with conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{(i)} \quad d_\pi \Phi = 0, \\ &\text{(ii)} \quad \frac{1}{2}\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\,[\pi,\pi] = N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi, \\ &\text{(iii)} \quad N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\mathfrak{L}_X\Phi - \iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\Phi - \iota_{(\mathfrak{L}_X N^*)(\alpha\wedge\beta)}\Phi = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any X in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ and α and β in $\Omega^1(M)$.

Furthermore, since quasi-Lie bialgebroids (of course, Lie bialgebroids also) construct Courant algebroids, we can obtain a new Courant algebroid from a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold similar to a Poisson Nijenhuis and Poisson quasi-Nijenhuis manifold. In other words, we can say that a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structure is a new material for constructing a Courant algebroid structure of $TM \oplus T^*M$. Therefore a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structure on M complements the bottom left of below the correspondence table:

a Courant algebroid structure [9] of $TM \oplus T^*M$		
a quasi-Lie bialgebroid [12] $((TM)_N, d_\pi, \Phi)$	a Lie bialgebroid [10] $((TM)_N, (T^*M)_\pi)$	a quasi-Lie bialgebroid [12] $((T^*M)_\pi, d_N, \phi)$
a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis (π, N, Φ) π : a 2-vector field N : a Nijenhuis Φ : a 3-vector field	a Poisson Nijenhuis [11] (π, N) π : a Poisson N : a Nijenhuis	a Poisson quasi-Nijenhuis [13] (π, N, ϕ) π : a Poisson N : a bundle map ϕ : a 3-form

We also obtain the notion of pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis Lie algebroids, which is the natural generalization of pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds. This is also analogous to Poisson Nijenhuis Lie algebroids [4] and Poisson quasi-Nijenhuis Lie algebroids [2].

This paper is constructed as follows. Section 2 consists of preliminaries to define pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds and to describe relations between those manifolds and quasi-Lie bialgebroids or Courant algebroids. In section 3, we define pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds and show that there is a one-to-one correspondence between a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold (M, π, N, Φ) and a quasi-Lie bialgebroid $((TM)_N, d_\pi, \Phi)$, which is the main theorem in this paper. Moreover we prove that we can reduce the condition (iii) of pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structures under the assumption that a 2-vector field π is nondegenerate. It seems very difficult due to the

condition (iii) to find non-trivial pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structures but we can construct many "nondegenerate" examples by this theorem. As such examples, we give ones made from symplectic Nijenhuis structures [14] and generalized almost complex structures [3].

2 Preliminaries

We begin by recalling the definitions of Courant algebroids.

Definition 1 ([9])**.** A *Courant algebroid* is a vector bundle $E \longrightarrow M$ equipped with a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (called the *pairing*) on the bundle, skew-symmetric bracket $[\![\cdot, \cdot]\!]$ on $\Gamma(E)$ and a bundle map $\rho : E \longrightarrow TM$ such that the following properties are satisfied: for any e, e_1, e_2, e_3 in $\Gamma(E)$, any f and g in $C^\infty(M)$,

(i) $\sum_{\mathrm{Cycl}(e_1,e_2,e_3)} [\![[\![e_1, e_2]\!], e_3]\!] = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{\mathrm{Cycl}(e_1,e_2,e_3)} \mathcal{D}\langle [\![e_1, e_2]\!], e_3 \rangle$,

(ii) $\rho([\![e_1, e_2]\!]) = [\rho(e_1), \rho(e_2)]$,

(iii) $[\![e_1, fe_2]\!] = f[\![e_1, e_2]\!] + (\rho(e_1)f)e_2 - \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle \mathcal{D}f$,

(iv) $\rho \circ \mathcal{D} = 0$, i.e., $\langle \mathcal{D}f, \mathcal{D}g \rangle = 0$,

(v) $\rho(e)\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle = \langle [\![e, e_1]\!] + \mathcal{D}\langle e, e_1 \rangle, e_2 \rangle + \langle e_1, [\![e, e_2]\!] + \mathcal{D}\langle e, e_2 \rangle \rangle$,

where $\mathcal{D} : C^\infty(M) \longrightarrow \Gamma(E)$ is the smooth map defined by

$$\langle \mathcal{D}f, e \rangle = \frac{1}{2}\rho(e)f.$$

The map ρ and the operator $[\![\cdot, \cdot]\!]$ are called an *anchor map* and a *Courant bracket*, respectively.

A Courant algebroid is not a Lie algebroid since the Jacobi identity is not satisfied due to (i). The following example is fundamental.

Example 1 ([9])**.** The direct sum $TM \oplus T^*M$ on a manifold M is a Courant algebroid. Here the anchor map, the pairing and the Courant bracket are given by

$$\rho(X + \xi) = X, \tag{1}$$

$$\langle X + \xi, Y + \eta \rangle = \tfrac{1}{2}(< \xi, Y > + < \eta, X >), \tag{2}$$

$$[\![X + \xi, Y + \eta]\!] = [X, Y] + \mathfrak{L}_X \eta - \mathfrak{L}_Y \xi + \tfrac{1}{2} d(< \xi, Y > - < \eta, X >), \tag{3}$$

where X and Y are in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ and ξ and η are in $\Omega^1(M)$. This is called *the standard Courant algebroid*.

Next we shall recall the definition of quasi-Lie bialgebroids.

Definition 2 ([12])**.** A *quasi-Lie bialgebroid* is a Lie algebroid $(A, [\cdot,\cdot]_A, a)$ equipped with a degree-one derivation d_* of the Gerstenhaber algebra $(\Gamma(\Lambda^* A), \wedge, [\cdot,\cdot]_A)$ and a 3-section of A, ϕ_A in $\Gamma(\Lambda^3 A)$ such that

$$d_*^2 = [\phi_A, \cdot]_A, \tag{4}$$
$$d_*\phi_A = 0. \tag{5}$$

If the 3-section ϕ_A is equal to 0, the quasi-Lie bialgebroid (A, d_*, ϕ_A) is just a Lie bialgebroid.

Example 2. Let (A, d_*, ϕ_A) be a quasi-Lie bialgebroid, where $A = (A, [\cdot,\cdot]_A, a)$, and $d_A : \Gamma(\Lambda^* A^*) \to \Gamma(\Lambda^{*+1} A^*)$ be the Lie algebroid derivative of A. Its double $E = A \oplus A^*$ has naturally a Courant algebroid structure. Namely, it is equipped with an anchor map ρ, a pairing $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and a Courant bracket $[\![\cdot,\cdot]\!]$ given by the following: for any X, Y in $\Gamma(A)$, any ξ and η in $\Gamma(A^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(X+\xi) &= a(X) + a_*(\xi),\\
\langle X+\xi, Y+\eta\rangle &= \tfrac{1}{2}(<\xi, Y> + <\eta, X>),\\
[\![X, Y]\!] &= [X, Y]_A\\
[\![\xi, \eta]\!] &= [\xi, \eta]_{A^*} + \phi_A(X, Y, \cdot)\\
[\![X, \xi]\!] &= (\iota_X d_A \xi + \tfrac{1}{2} d_A <\xi, X>)\\
&\quad -(\iota_\xi d_* X + \tfrac{1}{2} d_* <\xi, X>)
\end{aligned}$$

where the map $a_* : A^* \longrightarrow TM$ and the bracket $[\cdot,\cdot]_{A^*}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
a_*(\xi) f &:= <\xi, d_* f>,\\
<[\xi, \eta]_{A^*}, X> &:= a_*(\xi)<\eta, Y> - a_*(\eta)<\xi, X> - (d_* X)(\xi, \eta),
\end{aligned}$$

for $\xi, \eta \in \Gamma(A^*)$, $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ and $f \in C^\infty(M)$, respectively.

Taking $\phi_A = 0$, we obtain the Courant algebroid structure of a double of a Lie bialgebroid in [9].

3 Pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds

Let M be a C^∞-manifold, π a 2-vector field and $N : TM \longrightarrow TM$ a bundle map over M.

Definition 3 ([5])**.** The 2-vector field π on M and the bundle map N over M are *compatible* [6] if those satisfy

$$N \circ \pi^\sharp = \pi^\sharp \circ N^*, \tag{6}$$

$$C^N_\pi = 0, \tag{7}$$

where for any α and β in $\Omega^1(M)$,

$$C^N_\pi(\alpha,\beta) := [\alpha,\beta]_{N\pi^\sharp} - [\alpha,\beta]^{N^*}_\pi, \tag{8}$$

$$[\alpha,\beta]_{N\pi^\sharp} := \mathfrak{L}_{N\pi^\sharp\alpha}\beta - \mathfrak{L}_{N\pi^\sharp\beta}\alpha - d < N\pi^\sharp\alpha, \beta >, \tag{9}$$

$$[\alpha,\beta]^{N^*}_\pi := [N^*\alpha,\beta]_\pi + [\alpha, N^*\beta]_\pi - N^*[\alpha,\beta]_\pi \quad \text{and} \tag{10}$$

$$[\alpha,\beta]_\pi := \mathfrak{L}_{\pi^\sharp\alpha}\beta - \mathfrak{L}_{\pi^\sharp\beta}\alpha - d < \pi^\sharp\alpha, \beta > . \tag{11}$$

The bundle map N is a *Nijenhuis structure* on M if the Nijenhuis torsion

$$\mathcal{T}_N(X,Y) := [NX, NY] - N[X,Y]_N$$

vanishes for any X and Y in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$, where

$$[X,Y]_N := [NX, Y] + [X, NY] - N[X,Y].$$

Remark 1. (i) $(T^*M)_\pi = (T^*M, [\cdot,\cdot]_\pi, \pi^\sharp)$ is a Lie algebroid if and only if a 2-vector field π on M is Poisson. We define the derivation d_π by

$$\begin{aligned}(d_*\alpha)(X_0,\ldots,X_n) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n}(-1)^i a(X_i)(\alpha(X_0,\ldots,\hat{X}_i,\ldots,X_n)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i<j}(-1)^{i+j}\alpha([X_i,X_j]_A, X_0,\ldots,\hat{X}_i,\ldots,\hat{X}_j,\ldots,X_n),\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where α is in $\Gamma(\Lambda^* A^*)$ and X_i is in $\Gamma(A)$. The operator satisfies $d_\pi D = [\pi, D]$ for any D in $\Gamma(\Lambda^* TM)$.
(ii) $(TM)_N = (TM, [\cdot,\cdot]_N, N)$ is a Lie algebroid if and only if the map N is a Nijenhuis structure. We define the derivation d_N by the same formula as (12).

Let (π, N) be a compatible pair and set $\pi_N(\alpha,\beta) :=< N\pi^\sharp\alpha, \beta >$. Then it follows from (6) that π_N is a 2-vector field on M. We denote the bracket $[\cdot,\cdot]_{N\pi^\sharp}$ by $[\cdot,\cdot]_{\pi_N}$. If π is a Poisson structure on M, so is π_N.

As an analogy to the definition of Poisson quasi-Nijenhuis manifolds [13], we have the following.

Definition 4. Let M be a C^∞-manifold, π a 2-vector field on M, a bundle map $N : TM \to TM$ over M a Nijenhuis structure compatible with π, and Φ a 3-vector field on M. Then a triple (π, N, Φ) is a *pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structure* on M if the following conditions hold:

$$\text{(i)} \quad [\pi, \Phi] = 0, \tag{13}$$

$$\text{(ii)} \quad \frac{1}{2}\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\,[\pi,\pi] = N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi, \tag{14}$$

$$\text{(iii)} \quad N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\mathfrak{L}_X\Phi - \iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\Phi - \iota_{(\mathfrak{L}_X N^*)(\alpha\wedge\beta)}\Phi = 0, \tag{15}$$

where X is in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ and α and β are in $\Omega^1(M)$. The quadruple (M, π, N, Φ) is called a *pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold*.

Remark 2. The reason why we use not "quasi-" but "pseudo-" is to avoid confusion with another notion quasi-Poisson manifold in [1] [7].

Now we describe the main theorem in this paper. This is one of the fundamental properties of pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds. A similar result for Poisson quasi-Nijenhuis manifolds is also known [13].

Theorem 3.1. Let M be a C^∞-manifold, π a 2-vector field on M, N a Nijenhuis structure on M compatible with π and Φ a 3-vector field on M. Then a quadruple (M, π, N, Φ) is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold if and only if $((TM)_N, d_\pi, \Phi)$ is a quasi-Lie bialgebroid.

Proof. We assume that a quadruple (M, π, N, Φ) is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold. To prove that $((TM)_N, d_\pi, \Phi)$ is a quasi-Lie bialgebroid, we need to confirm the following three conditions: i) d_π is a degree-one derivation of the Gerstenhaber algebra $(\Gamma(\Lambda^* TM), \wedge, [\cdot,\cdot]_N)$, ii) $d_\pi^2 = [\Phi, \cdot]_N$ and iii) $d_\pi\Phi = 0$.

i) is equivalent to the following: for any X and Y in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$,

$$d_\pi[X,Y]_N = [d_\pi X, Y]_N + (-1)^{\deg X+1}[X, d_\pi Y]_N \tag{16}$$

holds. On the other hand, we see that for any α and β in $\Omega^1(M)$,

$$d_N[\alpha,\beta]_\pi = [d_N\alpha, \beta]_\pi + (-1)^{\deg\alpha+1}[\alpha, d_N\beta]_\pi \tag{17}$$

holds due to the proof of (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) of Proposition 3.2 in [5]. In addition, Theorem 3.10 in [9] essentially means that (16) holds if and only if (17) holds. In fact, Proposition 3.6, Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 3.11 in [9] are used to prove this theorem. However it is only used that π is a 2-vector field in the proofs of these propositions. The induced bundle map $\bar{\pi}_P^\sharp$ in Proposition

3.6 in [9] is $\pi_N^\sharp := N \circ \pi^\sharp$ in our case and we use only the skew-symmetry of $\pi_N^\sharp$ to prove (16). Since the skew-symmetry of $\pi_N^\sharp$ holds because of the compatibility of π and N, we obtain (16). Therefore i) holds.

Next, we show ii). For any f in $C^\infty(M)$ and any α and β in $\Omega^1(M)$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}(d_\pi^2 f)(\alpha,\beta) &= [\pi,[\pi,f]](\alpha,\beta) = \frac{1}{2}[[\pi,\pi],f](\alpha,\beta)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\iota_{df}[\pi,\pi](\alpha,\beta) = \frac{1}{2}[\pi,\pi](df,\alpha,\beta)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}[\pi,\pi](\alpha,\beta,df) = \frac{1}{2}\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}[\pi,\pi](df),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the graded Jacobi identity and the fact is used that $[D,f] = (-1)^{k+1}\iota_{df}D$ for any D in $\Gamma(\Lambda^k TM)$ in the third equality. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}[\Phi,f]_N(\alpha,\beta) &= \iota_{N^*df}\Phi(\alpha,\beta) = \Phi(N^*df,\alpha,\beta)\\ &= \Phi(\alpha,\beta,N^*df) = \iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi(N^*df)\\ &= (N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi)(df),\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $[D,f]_N = (-1)^{k+1}\iota_{N^*df}D$ for any D in $\Gamma(\Lambda^k TM)$ in the first step. Therefore it follows that $d_\pi^2 = [\Phi,\cdot]_N$ on $C^\infty(M)$ if and only if the equality (14) holds as a linear map on the exact 1-forms. By $C^\infty(M)$-linearity of (14) and the fact that the exact 1-forms generate locally the 1-forms as a $C^\infty(M)$-module, the equality (14) holds on $\Omega^1(M)$ if and only if $d_\pi^2 = [\Phi,\cdot]_N$ holds on $C^\infty(M)$.

Next, for any X in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$, any α,β and γ in $\Omega^1(M)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(d_\pi^2 X)(\alpha,\beta,\gamma) &= [\pi,[\pi,X]](\alpha,\beta,\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}[[\pi,\pi],X](\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\\ &= -\frac{1}{2}[X,[\pi,\pi]](\alpha,\beta,\gamma) = -\frac{1}{2}(\mathfrak{L}_X[\pi,\pi])(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\{\mathfrak{L}_X([\pi,\pi](\alpha,\beta,\gamma)) - [\pi,\pi](\mathfrak{L}_X\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\\ &\qquad -[\pi,\pi](\alpha,\mathfrak{L}_X\beta,\gamma) - [\pi,\pi](\alpha,\beta,\mathfrak{L}_X\gamma)\}\\ &= -\mathfrak{L}_X\left(\frac{1}{2}\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}[\pi,\pi](\gamma)\right) + \frac{1}{2}\iota_{\mathfrak{L}_X\alpha\wedge\beta}[\pi,\pi](\gamma)\\ &\qquad +\frac{1}{2}\iota_{\alpha\wedge\mathfrak{L}_X\beta}[\pi,\pi](\gamma) + \frac{1}{2}\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}[\pi,\pi](\mathfrak{L}_X\gamma)\\ &= -\mathfrak{L}_X\left((N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi)(\gamma)\right) + (N\iota_{\mathfrak{L}_X\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi)(\gamma)\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\quad +(N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\mathfrak{L}_X\beta}\Phi)(\gamma)+(N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi)(\mathfrak{L}_X\gamma)\\
&= -\mathfrak{L}_X\left(\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi(N^*\gamma)\right)+\iota_{\mathfrak{L}_X\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi(N^*\gamma)\\
&\quad +\iota_{\alpha\wedge\mathfrak{L}_X\beta}\Phi(N^*\gamma)+\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi(N^*\mathfrak{L}_X\gamma)\\
&= -\mathfrak{L}_X\left(\Phi(\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma)\right)+\Phi(\mathfrak{L}_X\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma)\\
&\quad +\Phi(\alpha,\mathfrak{L}_X\beta,N^*\gamma)+\Phi(\alpha,\beta,N^*\mathfrak{L}_X\gamma)\\
&= -\mathfrak{L}_X\left(\Phi(\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma)\right)+\Phi(\mathfrak{L}_X\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma)\\
&\quad +\Phi(\alpha,\mathfrak{L}_X\beta,N^*\gamma)+\Phi(\alpha,\beta,\mathfrak{L}_X(N^*\gamma)-(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\gamma)\\
&= -\mathfrak{L}_X\left(\Phi(\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma)\right)+\Phi(\mathfrak{L}_X\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma)\\
&\quad +\Phi(\alpha,\mathfrak{L}_X\beta,N^*\gamma)+\Phi(\alpha,\beta,\mathfrak{L}_X(N^*\gamma))\\
&\quad -\Phi(\alpha,\beta,(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\gamma)\\
&= -\left(\mathfrak{L}_X\Phi\right)(\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma)-\Phi(\alpha,\beta,(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\gamma),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second equality follows from the graded Jacobi identity and we use the equality (14) in the seventh equality . On the other hand, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\Phi,X]_N(\alpha,\beta,\gamma) &= -[X,\Phi]_N(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)=-(\mathfrak{L}^N_X\Phi)(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\\
&= -\mathfrak{L}^N_X(\Phi(\alpha,\beta,\gamma))+\Phi(\mathfrak{L}^N_X\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\\
&\quad +\Phi(\alpha,\mathfrak{L}^N_X\beta,\gamma)+\Phi(\alpha,\beta,\mathfrak{L}^N_X\gamma)\\
&= -\mathfrak{L}_{NX}(\Phi(\alpha,\beta,\gamma))\\
&\quad +\Phi(\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\alpha-(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\\
&\quad +\Phi(\alpha,\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\beta-(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\beta,\gamma)\\
&\quad +\Phi(\alpha,\beta,\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\gamma-(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\gamma)\\
&= -\mathfrak{L}_{NX}(\Phi(\alpha,\beta,\gamma))+\Phi(\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\\
&\quad +\Phi(\alpha,\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\beta,\gamma)+\Phi(\alpha,\beta,\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\gamma)\\
&\quad -\Phi((\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\alpha,\beta,\gamma)-\Phi(\alpha,(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\beta,\gamma)\\
&\quad -\Phi(\alpha,\beta,(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\gamma)\\
&= -(\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\Phi)(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)-\Phi((\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\\
&\quad -\Phi(\alpha,(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\beta,\gamma)-\Phi(\alpha,\beta,(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\gamma),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathfrak{L}^N$ is the Lie derivative of $(TM,[\cdot,\cdot]_N,N)$ defined by the Cartan formula on $\Omega^*(M)$ and we use the property that $\mathfrak{L}^N_X\alpha=\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\alpha-(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\alpha$ for any X in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ and any α in $\Omega^1(M)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
(d^2_\pi-[\Phi,X]_N)(\alpha,\beta,\gamma) &= -\left(\mathfrak{L}_X\Phi\right)(\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma)-\Phi(\alpha,\beta,(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\gamma)\\
&\quad +(\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\Phi)(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)+\Phi((\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\\
&\quad +\Phi(\alpha,(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\beta,\gamma)+\Phi(\alpha,\beta,(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\gamma)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= -(\mathfrak{L}_X\Phi)(\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma)+(\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\Phi)(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\\
&\quad +\Phi((\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\alpha,\beta,\gamma)+\Phi(\alpha,(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)\beta,\gamma)\\
&= -(N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\mathfrak{L}_X\Phi-\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\mathfrak{L}_{NX}\Phi\\
&\qquad -\iota_{(\mathfrak{L}_XN^*)(\alpha\wedge\beta)}\Phi)(\gamma).
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence it follows that $d_\pi^2=[\Phi,\cdot]_N$ on $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ if and only if the equality (15) holds.

Since d_π^2 and $[\Phi,\cdot]_N$ are derivatives on $(\Gamma(\Lambda^*TM),\wedge)$, it follows that $d_\pi^2=[\Phi,\cdot]_N$ on $C^\infty(M)\oplus\mathfrak{X}(M)$ if and only if $d_\pi^2=[\Phi,\cdot]_N$ on $\Gamma(\Lambda^*TM)$.

Finally, iii) is equivalent to (13) because of Remark 1. Therefore the proof has been completed. □

By the theorem, we have the following result of Kosmann-Schwarzbach [5].

Corollary 3.2. Under the same assumption as Theorem 3.1, the triple (M,π,N) is a Poisson Nijenhuis manifold if and only if $((TM)_N,d_\pi)$ is a Lie bialgebroid.

As in the case of Poisson quasi-Nijenhuis Lie algebroids [2], we can consider a straightforward generalization of pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds.

Definition 5. A *pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis Lie algebroid* (A,π,N,Φ) is a Lie algebroid A equipped with a 2-section π in $\Gamma(\Lambda^2A)$, a Nijenhuis structure $N:A\longrightarrow A$ compatible with π in the sense of Definition 3 and a 3-section Φ in $\Gamma(\Lambda^3A)$ satisfying the conditions (13), (14) and (15) replaced $[\cdot,\cdot]$ and $\mathfrak{L}$ with $[\cdot,\cdot]_A$ and $\mathfrak{L}^A$, respectively.

Theorem 3.3. If a quadruple (A,π,N,Φ) is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis Lie algebroid, then (A_N,d_π,Φ) is a quasi-Lie bialgebroid, where A_N is a Lie algebroid deformed by the Nijenhuis structure N.

Now we show three simple and important examples of pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds.

Example 3. A triple (π,N,Φ), where $\Phi=0$, is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structure if (π,N) is a Poisson-Nijenhuis structure.

Example 4. Let (M,π) be a Poisson manifold and set $N=0$. For any d_π-closed 3-vector field Φ, the triple (π,N,Φ) is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structure. Therefore, by Theorem 3.1 and Example 2, $((TM)_N,d_\pi,\Phi)$ is

a quasi-Lie bialgebroid and $((TM)_N \oplus (T^*M)_\pi, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, [\![\cdot,\cdot]\!]_\pi^\Phi, \rho)$ is a Courant algebroid, where

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![X,Y]\!]_\pi^\Phi &= [X,Y]_0 = 0,\\
[\![\xi,\eta]\!]_\pi^\Phi &= [\xi,\eta]_\pi + \Phi(\xi,\eta,\cdot),\\
[\![X,\xi]\!]_\pi^\Phi &= (\iota_X d_0\xi + \tfrac{1}{2}d_0 < \xi, X >)\\
&\qquad -(\iota_\xi d_\pi X + \tfrac{1}{2}d_\pi < \xi, X >)\\
&= -\iota_\xi d_\pi X - \tfrac{1}{2}d_\pi < \xi, X >,
\end{aligned}$$

the anchor map satisfies $\rho(X+\xi) = NX + \pi^\sharp\xi = \pi^\sharp\xi$ and the pairing is given by (2) for any X, Y in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$, any ξ and η in $\Omega^1(M)$.

Example 5. Let M be a C^∞-manifold and set $N = a\cdot \mathrm{id}_{TM}$, where a is a non-zero real number. For any 2-vector field π in $\Gamma(\Lambda^2 TM)$, the triple (π, N, Φ), where $\Phi = \frac{1}{2a}[\pi,\pi]$, is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structure. Therefore $((TM)_N, d_\pi, \Phi)$ is a quasi-Lie bialgebroid and $((TM)_N \oplus (T^*M)_\pi, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, [\![\cdot,\cdot]\!]_\pi^\Phi, \rho)$ is a Courant algebroid, where

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![X,Y]\!]_\pi^\Phi &= [X,Y]_{a\cdot\mathrm{id}_{TM}} = a[X,Y],\\
[\![\xi,\eta]\!]_\pi^\Phi &= [\xi,\eta]_\pi + \tfrac{1}{2a}[\pi,\pi](\xi,\eta,\cdot),\\
[\![X,\xi]\!]_\pi^\Phi &= (\iota_X d_{a\cdot\mathrm{id}_{TM}}\xi + \tfrac{1}{2}d_{a\cdot\mathrm{id}_{TM}} < \xi, X >)\\
&\qquad -(\iota_\xi d_\pi X + \tfrac{1}{2}d_\pi < \xi, X >)\\
&= a(\iota_X d\xi + \tfrac{1}{2}d < \xi, X >)\\
&\qquad -(\iota_\xi d_\pi X + \tfrac{1}{2}d_\pi < \xi, X >),
\end{aligned}$$

the anchor map satisfies $\rho(X+\xi) = aX + \pi^\sharp\xi$ and the pairing is given by (2) for any X, Y in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$, ξ and η in $\Omega^1(M)$.

Example 5 is an example of not a Poisson Nijenhuis manifold but a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold.

The following proposition means that two given pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds generate a new one.

Proposition 3.4. Let $(M_i, \pi_i, N_i, \Phi_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, be a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds. Then the product $(M_1 \times M_2, \pi_1 + \pi_2, N_1 \oplus N_2, \Phi_1 + \Phi_2)$ is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold.

Proof. Using the fact that $[X_1, X_2] = 0$ for any X_i in $\mathfrak{X}(M_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, etc., we can see that the triple $(\pi_1 + \pi_2, N_1 \oplus N_2, \Phi_1 + \Phi_2)$ satisfies that $N_1 \oplus N_2$ is a Nijenhuis structure on $M_1 \times M_2$, the compatibility of $(\pi_1 + \pi_2, N_1 \oplus N_2)$ and the conditions (13), (14) and (15) of Definition 4. □

From now on, we shall assume that a 2-vector field π is nondegenerate. Then we can reduce one condition of a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structure. This fact is important in the sense to be able to find pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structures easily.

Theorem 3.5. Let π be a nondegenerate 2-vector field, N a Nijenhuis structure and Φ a 3-vector field. If a triple (π, N, Φ) satisfies the conditions (13) and (14) in Definition 4, then (π, N, Φ) is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structure, i.e., (π, N, Φ) satisfies the condition (15).

Proof. We shall prove (15). By the nondegeneracy of π, the map $\pi^\sharp : T^*M \longrightarrow TM$ is a bundle isomorphism. Therefore a set $\{\pi^\sharp df |\ f \in C^\infty(M)\}$ generates the vector fields $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ as a $C^\infty(M)$-module. We have proved in Theorem 3.1 that the equality (14) holds if and only if $d_\pi^2 = [\Phi, \cdot]$ holds on $C^\infty(M)$. Thus we compute, for any f in $C^\infty(M)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_\pi^2(\pi^\sharp df) &= d_\pi^2(-d_\pi f) = -d_\pi(d_\pi^2 f) = -d_\pi[\Phi, f]_N \\ &= -([d_\pi\Phi, f]_N + [\Phi, d_\pi f]_N) \\ &= -[\Phi, d_\pi f]_N = [\Phi, \pi^\sharp df]_N, \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\pi^\sharp df = -d_\pi f$ in the first and the last step, the fourth equality follows from (16) and the fifth equality does from (13). Therefore $d_\pi^2 = [\Phi, \cdot]$ holds on the set $\{\pi^\sharp df |\ f \in C^\infty(M)\}$. Since $d_\pi^2 = [\Phi, \cdot]$ holds on $C^\infty(M) \oplus \{\pi^\sharp df |\ f \in C^\infty(M)\}$ and since both d_π^2 and $[\Phi, \cdot]_N$ are derivatives on $(\Gamma(\Lambda^* TM), \wedge)$, we obtain that $d_\pi^2 = [\Phi, \cdot]$ holds on $\mathfrak{X}(M)$. This is equivalent to the condition (15), so that the proof has been completed. □

Using this theorem, we obtain the following example of a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold.

Proposition 3.6. Let (M, ω, N) be a symplectic Nijenhuis manifold, i.e., for the nondegenerate Poisson structure π corresponding to ω, the pair (π, N) is a Poisson Nijenhuis structure, and ϕ a closed 3-form such that $\iota_{NX}\phi = 0$ for any X in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$. Then (M, π, N, Φ) is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold, where $\Phi = \pi^\sharp\phi$.

Proof. Since the Nijenhuis structure N is compatible with the nondegenerate Poisson structure π, we need to prove that (π, N, Φ) satisfies (13) and (14). In this case, the condition (14) is

$$N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi = 0 \ (\alpha, \beta \in \Omega^1(M))$$

because of $[\pi,\pi]=0$. By computing that, for any γ in $\Omega^1(M)$,

$$\begin{aligned} < N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}\Phi,\gamma > &= \Phi(\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma) = (\pi^\sharp\phi)(\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma) \\ &= -\phi(\pi^\sharp\alpha,\pi^\sharp\beta,\pi^\sharp N^*\gamma) = -\phi(\pi^\sharp\alpha,\pi^\sharp\beta,N\pi^\sharp\gamma) \\ &= -(\iota_{N(\pi^\sharp\gamma)}\phi)(\pi^\sharp\alpha,\pi^\sharp\beta) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we use $N\pi^\sharp = \pi^\sharp N^*$ and $\iota_{NX}\phi = 0$, we conclude that (14) holds. By a straightforward computation using the property of the Poisson structure π and the fact that ϕ is closed, we have

$$(d_\pi\Phi)(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_4) = (d\phi)(\pi^\sharp\alpha_1,\pi^\sharp\alpha_2,\pi^\sharp\alpha_3,\pi^\sharp\alpha_4) = 0$$

for any α_i in $\Omega^1(M)$. □

Example 6. On the 6-torus $\mathbb{T}^6$ with angle coordinates $(\theta_1,\theta_2,\theta_3,\theta_4,\theta_5,\theta_6)$, we consider the standard symplectic structure $\omega := d\theta_1\wedge d\theta_2 + d\theta_3\wedge d\theta_4 + d\theta_5\wedge d\theta_6$ and a regular Poisson structure with rank 2,

$$\pi_\lambda := \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_a}\wedge\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_b}+\lambda\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_c}\right),$$

where λ is in $\mathbb{R}$ and a,b and c are three distinct numbers(see [8]). Setting $N_\lambda := \pi_\lambda^\sharp\circ\omega^\flat$, we obtain a symplectic Nijenhuis structure (ω,N_λ) on $\mathbb{T}^6$. Since the rank of N_λ is 2 at each points, the kernel of N_λ^* is a subbundle with rank 4 of the cotangent bundle of $\mathbb{T}^6$. Hence for any closed 3-form ϕ in $\Gamma(\Lambda^3\mathrm{Ker}N_\lambda^*)$, a triple $(\pi_\omega,N_\lambda,\pi_\omega^\sharp\phi)$ is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis structure on $\mathbb{T}^6$, where π_ω is the Poisson structure corresponding to ω.

Finally, we describe a relation between pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds and generalized almost complex structures [3].

Definition 6. A *generalized almost complex structure* on a C^∞-manifold M is a bundle map over M,

$$J : TM\oplus T^*M \longrightarrow TM\oplus T^*M$$

satisfying the conditions

$$J^2 = -id_{TM\oplus T^*M} \quad\text{and}\quad \langle Jv,Jw\rangle = \langle v,w\rangle \tag{18}$$

for any v and w in $\Gamma(TM\oplus T^*M)$, where the pairing $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is given by (2) in Example 1. *The Courant-Nijenhuis torsion* $\mathcal{T}_J$ of J is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_J(v,w) := [\![Jv,Jw]\!] - J[\![v,w]\!]_J, \tag{19}$$
$$[\![v,w]\!]_J := [\![Jv,w]\!] + [\![v,Jw]\!] - J[\![v,w]\!] \tag{20}$$

for any v and w in $\Gamma(TM\oplus T^*M)$.

The conditions (18) imply that J is of the form

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} N & \pi^\sharp \\ \sigma^\flat & -N^* \end{pmatrix}, \tag{21}$$

where π in $\Gamma(\Lambda^2 TM)$ is a 2-vector field, σ in $\Omega^2(M)$ is a 2-form and $N : TM \longrightarrow TM$ is a bundle map over M. We have the corresponding result to Proposition 7.5 in [13].

Proposition 3.7. Let $J : TM \oplus T^*M \longrightarrow TM \oplus T^*M$ be a bundle map satisfying (18) and of the form (21). Then $(M, \pi, N, \pi^\sharp d\sigma_N)$ is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold if a generalized almost complex structure J satisfies the following conditions:

(i) π is nondegenerate,

(ii) σ is closed,

(iii) $\mathcal{T}_J|_{T^*M}$: $(2,1)$-tensor,

(iv) $\mathcal{T}_J|_{TM}$: $(1,2)$-tensor and

(v) $\mathcal{T}_J(\alpha,\beta) + \pi_N^\sharp(\mathcal{T}_J(\pi^\sharp\alpha, \pi^\sharp\beta)) = 0 \quad (\alpha, \beta \in \Omega^1(M), X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M))$,

where σ_N is the 2-form given by $\sigma_N(X,Y) := \sigma(NX, Y)$.

Proof. As observed in [2], π and N are compatible by the conditions $\mathcal{T}_J(\alpha,\beta)|_{T^*M} \equiv 0$ and $J^2 = -id_{TM\oplus T^*M}$, and N is Nijenhuis by the conditions $\mathcal{T}_J(X,Y)|_{TM} \equiv 0$ and $d\sigma = 0$. Moreover, by computing $\mathcal{T}_J(\alpha,\beta)|_{TM}$ and $\mathcal{T}_J(X,Y)|_{T^*M}$, we obtain

$$[\pi^\sharp\alpha, \pi^\sharp\beta] - \pi^\sharp[\alpha,\beta] = \mathcal{T}_J(\alpha,\beta), \tag{22}$$

$$\iota_{X\wedge Y} d\sigma_N = -\mathcal{T}_J(X,Y). \tag{23}$$

Since π is nondegenerate, we only need to prove that $(\pi, N, \pi^\sharp d\sigma_N)$ satisfies (13) and (14). First we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \frac{1}{2}\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}[\pi,\pi], \gamma \right\rangle &= \left\langle [\pi^\sharp\alpha, \pi^\sharp\beta] - \pi^\sharp[\alpha,\beta], \gamma \right\rangle = \langle \mathcal{T}_J(\alpha,\beta), \gamma \rangle \\
&= \left\langle -\pi_N^\sharp(\mathcal{T}_J(\pi^\sharp\alpha, \pi^\sharp\beta)), \gamma \right\rangle = \left\langle \mathcal{T}_J(\pi^\sharp\alpha, \pi^\sharp\beta), \pi_N^\sharp\gamma \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle -\iota_{\pi^\sharp\alpha\wedge\pi^\sharp\beta} d\sigma_N, \pi^\sharp N^*\gamma \right\rangle \\
&= -d\sigma_N(\pi^\sharp\alpha, \pi^\sharp\beta, \pi^\sharp N^*\gamma) = (\pi^\sharp d\sigma_N)(\alpha,\beta,N^*\gamma) \\
&= \left\langle \iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}(\pi^\sharp d\sigma_N), N^*\gamma \right\rangle = \left\langle N\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}(\pi^\sharp d\sigma_N), \gamma \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

for any γ in $\Omega^1(M)$, where we use the conditions (22), (23) and a property of 2-vector fields, $\frac{1}{2}\iota_{\alpha\wedge\beta}[\pi,\pi] = [\pi^\sharp\alpha, \pi^\sharp\beta] - \pi^\sharp[\alpha,\beta]$ (see [14]). Therefore the condition (14) holds. Next, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&(d_\pi(\pi^\sharp d\sigma_N))\,(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_4)\\
&\quad= \sum_{i=0}^{4}(-1)^{i+1}(\pi^\sharp\alpha_i)((\pi^\sharp d\sigma_N)(\alpha_1,\ldots,\hat{\alpha_i},\ldots,\alpha_4))\\
&\qquad+\sum_{i<j}(-1)^{i+j}(\pi^\sharp d\sigma_N)([\alpha_i,\alpha_j]_\pi,\alpha_1,\ldots,\hat{\alpha_i},\ldots,\hat{\alpha_j},\ldots,\alpha_4)\\
&\quad= -d(d\sigma_N)(\pi^\sharp\alpha_1,\pi^\sharp\alpha_2,\pi^\sharp\alpha_3,\pi^\sharp\alpha_4)\\
&\qquad+(d\sigma_N)(\pi_N^\sharp(\mathcal{T}_J(\pi^\sharp\alpha_1,\pi^\sharp\alpha_2)),\pi^\sharp\alpha_3,\pi^\sharp\alpha_4))\\
&\qquad-(d\sigma_N)(\pi_N^\sharp(\mathcal{T}_J(\pi^\sharp\alpha_1,\pi^\sharp\alpha_3)),\pi^\sharp\alpha_2,\pi^\sharp\alpha_4))\\
&\qquad+(d\sigma_N)(\pi_N^\sharp(\mathcal{T}_J(\pi^\sharp\alpha_1,\pi^\sharp\alpha_4)),\pi^\sharp\alpha_2,\pi^\sharp\alpha_3))\\
&\qquad+(d\sigma_N)(\pi_N^\sharp(\mathcal{T}_J(\pi^\sharp\alpha_2,\pi^\sharp\alpha_3)),\pi^\sharp\alpha_1,\pi^\sharp\alpha_4))\\
&\qquad-(d\sigma_N)(\pi_N^\sharp(\mathcal{T}_J(\pi^\sharp\alpha_2,\pi^\sharp\alpha_4)),\pi^\sharp\alpha_1,\pi^\sharp\alpha_3))\\
&\qquad+(d\sigma_N)(\pi_N^\sharp(\mathcal{T}_J(\pi^\sharp\alpha_3,\pi^\sharp\alpha_4)),\pi^\sharp\alpha_1,\pi^\sharp\alpha_2)) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

for any α_i in $\Omega^1(M)$, where we use the definitions of d, d_π and the condition (22). Hence the condition (13) holds. We conclude that $(M,\pi,N,\pi^\sharp d\sigma_N)$ is a pseudo-Poisson Nijenhuis manifold. □

References

[1] A. Alekseev and Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach. Manin pairs and moment maps. *J. Diff. Geom.* **56** (2000) 133–165.

[2] R. Caseiro, A. de Nicola and J. M. Nunes da Costa. On Poisson quasi-Nijenhuis Lie algebroids. *arXiv:0806.2467v1.* (2008).

[3] M. Gualtieri. Generalized complex geometry. *Ann. of Math.(2)* **174** (2011), no.1, 75–123.

[4] J. Grabowski and P. Urbanski. Lie algebroids and Poisson-Nijenhuis structures. *Rep. Math. Phys.* **40** (1997), 195–208.

[5] Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach. The Lie bialgebroid of a Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **38** (1996), no. 4, 421–428.

[6] Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach and F. Magri. Poisson-Nijenhuis structures. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor.* **53** (1990) no. 1, 35–81.

[7] Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach and E. Meinrenken. Quasi-Poisson manifolds. *Canad. J. Math.* **54**, no.1 (2000) 3–29.

[8] R. Loja Fernandes and I. Mărcut. Lectures on Poisson Geometry. (Springer, 2015).

[9] Z-J. Liu, A. Weinstein and P. Xu. Manin triple for Lie bialgebroids. *J. Differential Geom.* **45** (1997), no. 3 547–574.

[10] K. Mackenzie and P. Xu. Lie bialgebroids and Poisson groupoids. *Duke Math. J.* **73** (1994), no.2, 415–452.

[11] F. Magri and C. Morosi. On the reduction theory of the Nijenhuis operators and its applications to Gel'fand-Dikiĭ equations. *Proceedings of the IUTAM-ISIMM symposium on modern developments in analytical mechanics.* **117** (1983), Vol. II, 559–626.

[12] D. Roytenberg. Quasi-Lie bialgebroids and twisted Poisson manifolds. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **61** (2002) 123–137.

[13] M. Stiénon and P. Xu. Poisson Quasi-Nijenhuis manifolds. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **50** (2007), 709–725.

[14] I. Vaisman. Complementary 2-forms of Poisson structures. *Compositio math.* **101**(1996), no.1, 55–75.

[15] P. Xu. Gerstenhabar algebras and BV-algebras in Poisson geometry. *Comm. math. Phys.* **200**(1999) 545–560.